

7/12/75

Dear Jim,

Life is full of surprises and coincidences.

Last time we spoke you said you'd received many calls from listeners about the Wills vilification. You did not say you had read the piece but I assumed it. Thus I sent you the carbon of my long letter to him. To date he has not responded.

I waited about three weeks and then phoned the reporter he pretended to quote. That reporter called Wills an out and out liar and said he had said no such thing as Wills attributed to him.

All of this is entirely irrelevant to the original Wills dishonesty/distortion.

I was merely calling him on his irrelevancies, too.

His column did not address the guts of the transcript I gave away.

After speaking to this reporter I wrote Wills and the Wash. Star a second time. First I'd sent the transcript and asked that it be forwarded to the syndicate so it could provide copies to the papers taking Wills' column, inform its readers and learn what he writes and how.

Naturally there still has been no response. From anyone.

Why should the Star respond when it followed up with a sleeping-dogs editorial?

With your note in today's mail was a duplicate of the pair of columns the Star used May 29. I do not need them back.

I called yesterday for a different reason. It had to do with the CIA killing that scientist with an OD of LSD. I also have a Secret CIA paper dealing, ostensibly, with the USSR's use of these kinds of mind-twisting tricks. It says much about ours. Meaning the CIA's.

The victim was local. I know the oldest of his three children, a fine young man. First knew him when he was in high school maybe 15 years ago.

Not fearing the wrath of the Willises I spent a day giving this away, too, once the victim was identified. I suspect most of the major media copped out. One syndicate did send a reporter here and I did give him copies of this and another document.

(Odd how the government can't stand on or survive its own files once secrecy is ended, isn't it? And that now the ultras find ending secrecy is wrong but wrongful acts in secret are not.)

Unless it is killed ABC-TV is doing a bit on it tonight. My phone was too busy for the reporter to get back to me until after last evenings b'cast.

Pacifica asked me to read the entire thing and I did, by phone. Don't know what if anything they aired.

Update on my latest FOIA suit for suppressed JFK evidence: when I charged the FBI with perjury they invented a new defense. No, I don't think they intended giving me dust-jacket copy in saying I could make this kind of charge ad infinitum because I know more about the subject than anyone in the FBI. At the same time they were considerate enough to provide me with more perjury. Tuesday, which is before you can get this, is the next hearing. The judge is the one just overruled in his finding that the FBI does not need warrants for wiretaps.

Best,